REMARKS

The instant Application was filed on October 14, 2003 and contained claims 1-25. In the most recent Office Action, the Office has rejected claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over various pieces of prior art. In response to the most recent Office Action, Applicants have amended claim 1 and canceled non-elected claims 14-25. Applicants contend that, in view of the amendments to the claims and the discussion set forth herein below, all the Office's rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims submitted.

The Office Action

The Office has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,534,033 ('033) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,696,806 ('806).

The Office has also rejected claims 5 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,534,033 ('033) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,696,806 ('806) and U.S. Patent No. 5,228,529 ('529).

Further, the Office has rejected claims 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,534,033 ('033) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,696,806 ('806) and U.S. Patent No. 5,277,999 ('999).

PAGE 7/10 * RCVD AT 7/10/2006 5:43:15 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/42 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:2488442273 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-10

Finally, the Office has rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,534,033 ('033) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,696,806 ('806) and U.S. Patent No. 5,690,902 ('902).

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

For the reasons which follow hereinafter, all of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

The Office suggests that the base invention of the instant patent application(i.e. claim 1) is obvious given the teachings of the '033 reference in view of the '806 reference. However, an analysis of the teachings of the two references shows that even if one were to combine the teachings of these references, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have arrived at the instantly claimed invention.

Turning first to the '033 reference, there is taught a reactor and method for forming hydrogen by reacting chemical metal hydride with water to form hydrogen. The slurry or solution of the chemical metal hydride is passed from a first holding tank 30 to a reaction tank 70, in which a catalyst 80 is disposed. The catalyst 80 catalyzes the reaction of the chemical hydride and water, thus producing hydrogen in the second tank 70. The '033 reference further suggests that "the hydrogen can be vented off from the waste reservoir to a separate hydrogen storage tank", column 14, lines 50-51. Therefore, the '033 reference does clearly suggest that the hydrogen can be stored in a separate storage tank.

Turning now to the '806 reference, there is taught a hydrogen gas purification technique in which a feed stream of hydrogen (produced in a reaction process that is

PAGE 8/10 * RCVD AT 7/10/2006 5:43:15 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/42 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:2488442273 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-10

separate from the purification process) is absorbed and desorbed using a series of hydrogen storage alloy beds. Thus it is clear from the teachings of the '806 reference that hydrogen produced from a separate reaction process can be stored (and purified) by the use of hydrogen storage alloy tanks.

Therefore, combining the teachings of the '033 and '809 references, one of ordinary skill in the art would use the hydrogen storage alloy tanks of the '809 reference to store the hydrogen produced in the reaction chamber 70 of the '033 reference. Therefore the combination would include a slurry storage tank 30, a reaction tank 70, and a hydrogen storage alloy tank for hydrogen storage. This combination is **not** what is disclosed and claimed in the present application.

The present invention combines the reaction chamber and the storage tank into one unit and the hydrogen storage alloy bed either is the catalyst for the hydrogen production reaction or contains the catalyst. There is no suggestion or teaching in any of the cited references which makes the present invention obvious. As disclosed above, even if the two reference are combined, one of ordinary skill in the art would not (absent the teachings of the instant specification) derive the present invention. Thus the present obviousness rejections are untenable and should be withdrawn.

PAGE 9/10 * RCVD AT 7/10/2006 5:43:15 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/42 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:2488442273 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-10

Conclusion

Claims 1-13 remain at issue. In view of the amendments to the claims and the discussion presented herein above, Applicants submit that the present application in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the application to issuance.

Should the Examiner have any comments or suggestions which would place the instant application in better condition for allowance, Applicants earnestly request the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Schumaker
Reg. No 35,017

Date: July 10, 2006

Energy Conversion Devices, Inc
2956 Waterview
Rochester Hills, MI 48309
Phone: (248) 299-6047
Fax: (248) 844-2273
e-mail schumaker@ovonic.com

PAGE 10/10 * RCVD AT 7/10/2006 5:43:15 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/42 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:2488442273 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-10